

COVER SHEET: Lake Davis Pike Eradication Project Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS)

Plumas County, California

State CEQA Lead Agency: California Department of Fish and Game (DFG)

Federal NEPA Lead Agency: USDA Forest Service, Plumas National Forest (PNF)

Cooperating Agencies: CA Dept. of Water Resources, CA Dept. of Health Services, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, Plumas County Environmental Health Department, CA Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, National Marine Fisheries Service, CA State Water Resources Control Board, CA Dept. of Pesticide Regulation, CALTRANS, EPA, CA Dept. of Food & Agriculture, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, CA State Historic Preservation Office, Plumas County Agriculture Commissioner.

Responsible Officials:	L. Ryan Broddrick, Director CA Dept Fish and Game 1416 Ninth Street Sacramento, CA 95814	James M. Peña, Forest Supervisor Plumas National Forest PO Box 11500/159 Lawrence Street Quincy, CA 95971
-------------------------------	--	---

For Information Contact:	Ed Pert CA Dept Fish and Game 1812 Ninth Street Sacramento, CA 95814 (916) 445-3584	Angela Dillingham, USFS Plumas National Forest PO Box 11500/159 Lawrence Street Quincy, CA 95971 (530) 283-7761
---------------------------------	--	--

Abstract:

The DFG has identified the fish northern pike as a detrimental invasive species to Lake Davis, California. Northern pike have degraded the trout fishery at Lake Davis, as well as the local economic sectors dependant on that fishery. Pike, should they escape Lake Davis, also present a serious threat to aquatic ecosystems and sport and commercial fisheries in other parts of the state and region. Therefore, the DFG proposes to drawdown Lake Davis and apply a liquid rotenone formulation to Lake Davis and its tributary streams. The PNF proposes to issue the DFG a Special Use Permit (SUP) and implement two Forest Closure Orders to facilitate the eradication of pike. Seven alternatives are considered in this joint Draft EIR/EIS. Alternatives vary in the degree to which the reservoir water level would be lowered and in the formulation of rotenone utilized. A non-chemical alternative for eradication as well as the no action alternative are also evaluated. At this time, the DFG preferred alternative is the Proposed Project. The PNF preferred alternative is to issue the SUP and two forest closure orders.

Send comments to DFG and PNF at:	Lake Davis Pike Eradication Project, Attention: Ed Pert 1812 Ninth Street, Sacramento, CA 95814 Fax: (916) 445-4044, comment link at www.dfg.ca.gov/northernpike
-------------------------------------	---

Acceptable written comment formats are surface mail, fax, electronic (MS Word or Rich Text Format), and hand delivery. Verbal comments may be submitted by appointment with the USFS, or at the Public Comment Hearings scheduled for September 26, 2006 in Portola, CA and October 5, 2006 in Sacramento, CA.

The opportunity to comment ends 45 days following publication of the notice of availability (NOA) in the Federal Register, and provision of the State's notice of availability to the public and the State's notice of completion to the State Office of Planning and Research. The estimated date for these events is September 1, 2006, which would result in a comment deadline of October 16, 2006.

Required NEPA Notification: Reviewers should provide the PNF with their comments during the review period of the Draft EIR/EIS. This will enable the lead agencies to analyze and respond to the comments at one time and to use information acquired in the preparation of the Final EIR/EIS for timely decision-making. Reviewers have an obligation to structure their participation in the National Environmental Policy Act processes so that it is meaningful and alerts the agencies to the reviewers' position and contentions (Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. NRDC, 435 U.S. 519,553 [1978]). Environmental objections that could have been raised at the draft stage may be waived if not raised until after completion of the Final EIR/EIS (City of Angoon vs. Hodel [9th Circuit, 1986] and Wisconsin Heritages, Inc. v. Harris, 490 F. Supp. 1334, 1338 [E.D. Wis. 1980]). Comments should be specific and should address the adequacy of the statement and the merits of the alternatives discussed (40 CFR 1503.3).